



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,940	04/14/2004	Tatsuya Kuroda	09792909-5866	5280

26263 7590 06/29/2009
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

SARPONG, AKWASI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/823,940	Applicant(s) KURODA ET AL.	
	Examiner AKWASI M. SARPONG	Art Unit 2625	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED on 06/24/2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-5 and 7.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/King Y. Poon/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Akwasi M Sarpong/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The remarks filed by the applicant on 06/24/2009 was carefully considered but was not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant argues that the cited references fail to teach or suggest an image-processing unit operable to perform any combination of operable to perform any combination of (i) rotating a print-medium image, (ii) rotating a print image, and (iii) simultaneously rotating both the print image and the print-medium image.

In reply, examiner respectfully disagrees because as clearly discussed in the Office action. Carriffe discloses rotating the print image (Col. 2 lines 30-35 hence the print image which is the flower is rotated when the user select button 52).

However Carriffe does not disclose rotating the print-medium image and simultaneously rotating both the print image and the print-medium image.

Barrett discloses a copier which is an image processing device like the one taught by Carriffe discloses any combination of by (i) rotating the print-medium image, (Fig. 11 shows clearly that the image "A" and "B" stays the same while the rectangular box is rotated (medium)) simultaneously rotating both the print image and the print- medium image. (Col. 8, lines 36-50, Fig. 11- thus in order for the copier to output the image in a booklet form, both the image "A" and "B" and the print medium has to be rotated as clearly shown in Fig. 11 under the rotation required for right side up orientation column).

Again applicant argues that element 41 does not include a print-medium image and therefore it will not obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Carriffe's image processing device with Barrett's copier.

Examiner respectfully disagrees because both disclosure is classified under the same USPTO classification 358 and also both uses editing program when rotating the image. (NB understand that you are editing the image when the orientation of the image data is changed from calendar to booklet). Therefore YES it will be obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify on image processor with the other image processor (Copier).

Again it will be obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made because in both reference a user has to trigger editing- hence (in Carriffe, button 52 has to be pressed) and in Barrett the user has to select that the image has to be in a booklet form. It can therefore be obvious for one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Carriffe's image processor with Barrett's controller so that a user can select a booklet form in Carriffe's processor. The motivation for doing this is to make users be able to view their images in different angles or can be edited in so many ways. .